

## Tilburg University

### The role of codeswitching, loan translation and interference in the emergence of an immigrant variety of Turkish

Backus, A.

*Publication date:*  
2010

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Backus, A. (2010). *The role of codeswitching, loan translation and interference in the emergence of an immigrant variety of Turkish*. (pp. 225-241). (Working Papers in Corpus-based Linguistics and Language Education; Vol. 5). Unknown Publisher.

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# The Role of Codeswitching, Loan Translation and Interference in the Emergence of an Immigrant Variety of Turkish

**Ad BACKUS**

**(Tilburg University, The Netherlands)**

Ad Backus, PhD (A.M.Backus@uvt.nl) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Language & Culture at Tilburg University, and is also a member of the Babylon research group, which specializes in the study of multiculturalism and multilingualism. His empirical work has mostly been on Turkish-Dutch codeswitching and contact-induced language change in immigrant varieties of Turkish. Most analyses are done within a cognitive-linguistic theoretical framework. He has published in journals such as *Linguistics*, *International Journal of Bilingualism* and *Bilingualism: Language & Cognition*.

This chapter has three goals. First, I aim to provide a unified account of three effects of language contact that are often treated separately. Second, this exercise should illustrate the value that studying the effects of language contact can have for general theoretical linguistics. Third, the analysis should show that it is important to be more aware of the synchronic and diachronic aspects of linguistic phenomena. Especially in contact linguistics, failure to distinguish them has caused some quite misguided debates, for example about how to distinguish codeswitching and borrowing. Linguistics tends to separate synchronic and diachronic issues, even to the extent that some branches deal with synchronic issues only ('theoretical linguistics') and another with diachronic ones ('historical linguistics'). I will argue that this separation is not always good, since a full account of many linguistic phenomena requires an understanding of the close relationship between these two dimensions.

Another separation I will examine critically is that between lexicon and syntax. This distinction is of course both useful and commonplace in linguistics, but not recognizing that they form a continuum rather than two discrete 'modules' makes us miss some important generalizations. In language contact, the distinction is responsible for the lack of theorizing about what codeswitching

and contact-induced structural change have in common. In this article, I will attempt to show that these phenomena too can be placed on a continuum.

## **1. Synchrony and diachrony in language contact**

Linguists have become used to making a strict separation between synchronic and diachronic issues. This has led to a split in the field: while ‘theoretical linguistics’ deals with synchronic issues almost exclusively, diachrony is the sole purview of historical linguistics. Whatever the advantages of an increased focus on synchrony may be, this has kept linguistics from developing a coherent theory of how languages change. The field of contact linguistics has also witnessed a testy debate that goes back to this distinction, and to the failure to recognize that the distinction should not be taken to mean that synchronic and diachronic issues have nothing to do with each other. This is the debate about how to distinguish a codeswitch from a borrowing. This question has been taken to be a purely synchronic one, and this, I want to argue below, misses the point completely. The reason is that the synchronic and diachronic dimensions are not independent of each other.

Synchronic behavior determines diachronic development. Theories of language contact phenomena would benefit from this insight as it provides an elegant model of how lexical borrowing comes about. To take an example from my personal life: after I had been exposed to American English for a while I became aware of the word ‘Catch-22’, to refer to a situation in which one needs to fulfill a certain condition in order to get something desirable done, but one can’t get that condition fulfilled if the desirable outcome is not already taken care of (for example when one needs a residence permit to get health insurance, but one also needs health insurance in order to be eligible for such a permit). In the modern bureaucratic world, such a concept is nameworthy enough to be lexicalized, as American English has done using the title of a novel by Joseph Heller. Now, when I first used the term in my native Dutch, I produced a codeswitch to English, inserting the English word in a Dutch sentence. However, as I kept using it, slowly but surely it became a fairly common word in my Dutch. In other words, I had borrowed it. To the extent that there are many Dutch people who have had enough exposure to American English, or to Dutch people like me who use the word, it may well have become an established loanword in Dutch.

While I have used a lexical example to illustrate the basic mechanism, the same scenario is hypothesized to hold at all linguistic levels. All change is an adjustment to the degree to which an element is entrenched in a speaker’s linguistic knowledge, no matter whether this element is phonetic, phonological, lexical, morphological, syntactic, semantic or pragmatic in nature. This holistic conceptualization of language as involving form-meaning combinations that differ in their specific characteristics but not in general format is not common to all linguistic theories (it is notably absent from generative theories with their emphasis on the modularity of the linguistic system), but it has been fruitfully employed in theories such as Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 2008), Construction Grammar (Goldberg 2005) and Emergent Grammar (Bybee 2006). Two aspects

of these theories also play a crucial role in the present contribution: lexicon and syntax are placed on a continuum (both contain form-meaning units, but lexical units are semantically specific and have phonological substance, while structural units are semantically schematic and have no phonological substance, i.e. they need to be instantiated in actual clauses), and diachronic issues are part and parcel of what the theory needs to explain (while generative theories typically separate diachronic issues out, to be dealt with by separate theories). The second point is a logical consequence of the usage-based approach to language that typifies these theories. Knowledge representation is assumed to be the direct result of usage (both active use and passive exposure), and is therefore inherently variable and changeable. This is in contrast, of course, to the innate knowledge postulated in generative accounts of language. In the Cognitive Linguistic theories, historical linguistics and sociolinguistics are not accorded the status of separate theories anymore, dealing with their own sets of topics. Their traditional domains of inquiry, change and variation, are accepted as central to the concerns of linguistics in general.

The above description of a prototypical change suggests there are two stages that need to be distinguished: innovation and propagation. The innovation is, of course, the first usage of the new feature (the word ‘Catch-22’ in the example above); the rest, ever increasing use of the feature, is propagation. Obviously, this phenomenon is not limited to language contact: fluctuations in entrenchment are presumably the typical state of all linguistic elements. This, at least, is what a usage-based account of language hypothesizes. How to prove it is another matter.

Codeswitching studies are generally not designed well for studying issues of change. Since change has not figured much in codeswitching theories, this is not surprising. However, the seemingly endless debate about how to distinguish borrowing and codeswitching is a direct result of this failure to take into account the issue of language change. Empirical studies of codeswitching generally record a body of data, typically spontaneous bilingual speech, and search the transcripts for the occurrence of various types of mixed language. This work has provided us with a rich database about what occurs and what does not in the arena of language mixing. Models such as those worked out by Myers-Scotton (2002) and Muysken (2000) do a good job of summarizing the generalizations that can be drawn from this body of work. My own work is partially part of this tradition, focusing empirically on the mixed speech in the Turkish immigrant community in The Netherlands.

## **2. Turkish in The Netherlands**

Like many other countries in Western Europe, notably Germany, The Netherlands attracted guest workers from Turkey and other Mediterranean countries in the 1960’s. Originally meant by all involved to be a temporary arrangement involving young male unskilled workers, the migrant community soon turned into a regular immigrant community, by now spanning three generations.

People of Turkish descent are a noticeable presence in the major cities; the size of the community is about 350.000, making up 2% of the Dutch total.

The most important language-related fact about this community is that it has a high degree of language maintenance. Mostly because of a continuous influx of monolinguals, especially as new spouses, one of the parents in a typical immigrant family will be Turkish-dominant, which ensures that Turkish tends to be the language of the home. In addition, ties with Turkey are relatively easy to maintain (cheap travel and telecommunication possibilities). What all this means, is that Turkish as a minority language is a relatively good object of study for contact linguistics, because language change can be studied during a fairly long time span. Classical immigration settings tend to last only three generations, and any changes that take time to take hold in a community tend to be cut off by shift. In the Turkish immigrant setting in The Netherlands, however, they may run a much longer course.

The data to be used in the present contribution consist of the following:

- Codeswitching data collected from various types of bilinguals in the form of self-recordings of natural conversations among friends (Backus 1992, 1996)
- ‘NL-Turkish’ data from second generation Turkish-origin immigrants in Tilburg in The Netherlands, recorded in conversation with a monolingual speaker from Turkey, so as to ensure a monolingual mode (needed to force such speakers to speak pretty much only Turkish rather than mix their languages freely, Doğruöz 2007)
- TR-Turkish’ data, recorded in similar contexts as the NL-Turkish data, but with monolingual speakers in Turkey, specifically in the area (Kırşehir) from where the immigrant informants’ families hailed. To ensure maximum comparability, these informants were also between 18-30 years old, and they had all finished a high school education (Doğruöz 2007).

None of these conversations followed any prescribed format, though naturally the group conversations had a more spontaneous character than the conversations with an interviewer. All recordings were fully transcribed.

### **3. Codeswitching and language change**

In order to explore the link between codeswitching, the pre-eminent visible sign of language contact, and language change, we first need to be clear about what exactly codeswitching is. In this contribution, the currently most widely accepted division into two main types, insertion and alternation, is assumed (Muysken 2000). The division is largely similar to the older distinction between intrasentential and intersentential, but is less dependent on syntactic analysis (e.g. on your answer to the question what exactly constitutes a sentence) and clearly based on the assumption that

psycholinguistic processing mechanisms underlying the two types are different. In insertion, a grammatical frame in one language may host one or more content words from another language, while in alternation monolingual chunks in two different languages alternate. In insertional codeswitching, distinguishing between a Matrix Language (ML) and an Embedded Language (EL) makes sense; in alternation, it does not. Typical examples of insertion and alternation appear in (1a) and (1b) below<sup>1</sup>.

- (1) a. *Nachttrein*-i            orda        *Randstad*-da        dolaş-ıp            dur-uyor  
*night.train*-POSS        there        *R.*-LOC            go.around-CONJ        keep-PROG.3sg  
‘The *night train* keeps going around there in the *Randstad* [=metropolitan area in Western Holland].’
- b. sen de kalkma-n lazım onlar-la *en hoe moet je dan op de rest letten?*  
You too get.up-POSS.2SG necessary them-with and how must you then on the rest  
keep.an.eyey?  
‘you must get up with them as well, *and then how can you keep an eye on the rest?*’

Note that the example in (1a) tells us that at least one speaker of NL-Turkish has at least once used the Dutch words *nachttrein* and *Randstad*, but the example cannot tell us whether these words are established loanwords in the immigrant variety of Turkish. Most likely, they are, since it is unlikely that this particular speaker used these words for the first time here, nor is it likely that no other speakers use them. This is not just because it would be such coincidence if this unique moment was captured on tape here, but also because the words themselves are typical candidates for loanword status: they are semantically specific (especially the Proper Noun) and connected to Dutch culture. That ensures there is probably no competition with any Turkish equivalents, so that speakers will seize upon the usefulness of these particular words and use them recurrently.

The distinction above between insertion and alternation, of course, glosses over many subcategories within each type. An important complication is that insertion does not just involve simple content words. A grammatical frame may host fairly complex insertions from the other language. An example is provided in (2), in which a Dutch multi-word unit, consisting of a verb and a prepositional phrase, is inserted into a Turkish clausal frame.

- (2) *op kamers*            *wonen*    yap-acağ-ım  
*on rooms*            *live*        do-FUT-1sg  
‘I’m going to *live on my own*.’

---

<sup>1</sup> In these and all other examples, normal print is used for Turkish, and italics for Dutch.

Both simple words such as *nachttrein* and *Randstad* and complex units such as *op kamers wonen* can become established loanwords. In fact, their occurrence in codeswitching data all but ensures that they are. Lexical borrowing is the diachronic counterpart of synchronic codeswitching. Borrowing is the process whereby words from a lending language become entrenched as conventional words in the receiving lexicon. Technically, an EL word or multiword unit in the type of mixed clause encountered in codeswitching data, can be either a ‘new’ code-switch or an ‘established’ loanword. However, given that the recorded conversations capture a minute slice of the speakers’ language use, it is likely that each and every EL word so encountered has already been established as a loanword to some extent, not just the subset of words that recur in the data or that are clearly so semantically special that there is no native Turkish equivalent. These words *appear* as codeswitches, but most likely they *are* loanwords. This appearance is due to the fact that the data capture just one synchronic event, which means they are by definition unsuitable for demonstrating recurrent usage. This could only be investigated if a huge amount of data was available, along the lines of the electronic corpora available for major languages such as English. Compiling such corpora for contact varieties such as NL-Turkish is unlikely ever to happen. Happily, they are not strictly necessary for the questions that concern us here. In fact, they wouldn’t even constitute optimal data. What is needed, instead, is speakers’ judgments on the frequency of use and/or acceptability of particular Dutch words in NL-Turkish speech. Research employing such methods is currently in the planning stage; in a way it may be considered astonishing that it has not been done yet in any of the contact situations in which the occurrence of codeswitching in natural speech has been investigated, particularly given the persistence of the question how to distinguish codeswitching from borrowing. The reason for this state of affairs, it seems, must be the failure in codeswitching studies to recognize that codeswitching pertains to a synchronic event while borrowing pertains to a diachronic process. The dichotomy, that is, is a false one. To claim that a particular constraint, for example the Free Morpheme Constraint, applies to codeswitches but not to borrowings, is to say that it constrains how one can use an ad-hoc word taken from another language. This is, of course, completely at odds with the view on the mechanism of lexical borrowing outlined here. How could a pattern that is ruled out for the initial stages of the borrowing process end up being the default pattern once that process is underway?

The way out of this morass, I suggest, is to assume that diachronic borrowing results from synchronic codeswitching. In synchronic studies, such as the analysis of a corpus of mixed speech, borrowing is not a relevant category, unless there is further usage information on the alleged loanword. That does not mean, incidentally, that the Free Morpheme and Equivalence Constraints are useless. Different types of codeswitches might well behave differently, e.g. insertion and alternation. Indeed, no model of codeswitching has claimed to cover both types. Especially the Equivalence Constraint might well prove to be a fairly accurate description of alternational codeswitching and a third type distinguished by Muysken (2000), ‘congruent lexicalization’: switching between languages is easier where their structures overlap.

However, codeswitching is not the only kind of language contact phenomenon that is implicated in contact-induced change. Loan translations, also known as ‘calques’, also have this synchronic-diachronic duality. They are words or phrases that are reproduced as more or less literal translations from one language into another. An example is given in (3).

- (3) suç-u                      bana      ver-di  
       guilt-ACC              to.me    give-PAST.3sg  
       ‘he accused me’  
       TR-Turkish: *suçlamak* ‘accuse’: suç-la-mak ‘guilt-VERBALIZER-INF’  
       Dutch: *de schuld geven*; ‘give the guilt’

The combination of the noun ‘guilt’ and the verb ‘give’ is not used in TR-Turkish, but has been attested repeatedly in NL-Turkish. While the combination is semantically transparent, and thus could theoretically be a language-internal innovation, the fact that Dutch uses exactly this combination makes it likely that NL-Turkish speakers have transferred the Dutch unit to Turkish, in translated form. The diachronic result is contact-induced change; this time not in the form of a loanword but in a new combination of existing words, a new multiword unit. A similar account can be given for contact-induced meaning change (‘semantic extension’), cf. Backus & Dorleijn (2009). Loan translations are by far the least commonly discussed type of crosslinguistic influence, and they will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

To summarize the findings so far, it has been suggested that the sheer occurrence as codeswitches and loan translations in synchronic data suggests they are in general use, and therefore are the result of contact-induced change. Semantic plausibility often offers further support for the idea that they have been taken over by more than just this one speaker: they are useful enough so as to assure usage. However, frequency and/or acceptability data would be helpful, as purely synchronic data provide no evidence whatsoever for the diachronic status. This holds both for simple words and for larger conventional units.

The third type of contact phenomenon is structural interference. While lexical phenomena tend to be interpreted with a synchronic bias, structural phenomena are more often seen in a diachronic light. That is, the focus is not so much on synchronic interference of the two grammatical systems in the mind of the speaker, but on change in the system. Nevertheless, the same division into synchronic and diachronic sides of the coin can be made for this phenomenon as well. Example (4) features an NL-Turkish construction that is not used this way in TR-Turkish, and that betrays Dutch influence. The demonstrative pronoun *o* functions as part of an intensifying construction. This construction exists in Dutch as well, and is used when some sort of expletive is needed in order to convey frustration on the part of the speaker. The same meaning is intended in the NL-Turkish example, and the demonstrative pronoun is marshaled for this function presumably because of the model provided by Dutch. As with the lexical examples (both codeswitching and loan translation),



there is no telling on the basis of one-off occurrence in a corpus whether the speaker was undergoing actual interference from Dutch at the moment of speaking or simply used a by now established NL-Turkish construction. Note that the term ‘interference’ is so established that it should not be assumed that any author who uses it to describe examples such as this one intends to say that the speaker actually underwent synchronic interference: the term is also (mostly, perhaps) used to hint at the historical origin of the construction: someone, at some point, certainly underwent interference: whether a speaker caught using the construction in a corpus had his Dutch interfere with his Turkish cannot be determined. Once more, data that could differentiate between the two explanations are not available. High frequency of the construction would suggest an established construction, not synchronic interference, but constructions such as this one are not used all that often, so low frequency does not necessarily prove the opposite. And, once more, judgment data from informants about the relative frequency of such constructions have never been collected, to the best of my knowledge.

- (4)      yani kendimi ifade etmek istersem bile edemem çünkü o sözcükleri bulamam  
           so myself express do if.I.want even I.cannot.do because those words I.cannot.find  
           ‘so even if I want to express myself, I can’t, because I cannot find those damn words’  
           TR-Turkish: ... çünkü sözcükleri bulamam, (i.e. without *o*)  
           Dutch: ik kan die woorden niet vinden (‘I can those words not find’);

Structural change has been studied much more intensively in diachronically oriented historical linguistics than in synchronically oriented contact linguistics. It would be good to join hands, though, because understanding how past changes came about becomes easier if we have in-depth knowledge of how change progresses in on-going contact settings. The goal should be to understand what mechanisms produce interference and change, and this is only observable in contact settings that are still going on. In the last two decades, starting with Thomason & Kaufman (1988), but echoing pioneering work by Weinreich (1953), this rapprochement has been developing, and it has already given great rewards. Important landmarks include Thomason’s (2001) list of possible mechanisms, Heine & Kuteva’s (2005) framework of grammatical replication, Johanson’s (2002) ‘Code Copying’ framework linking codeswitching and structural interference, Ross’ (2008) formulation of a theory of ‘metatypy’, and Matras & Sakel’s (2007) attempts to improve predictability of theories of change.

My own contribution to all this has been in the shape of two types of studies using empirical data from NL-Turkish: codeswitching studies and, more recently, some studies undertaken in collaboration with Seza Doğruöz on contact-induced structural change. The latter have focused on innovative constructions in general, such as the one in Ex. (4) above, and two specific syntactic environments that were hypothesized to be susceptible to contact-induced change: clausal word order and the use of overt subject pronouns.

The main result of the latter type of study was that at the more abstract syntactic levels, word order and pro-drop, little change was in evidence. Yet, the NL-Turkish data were full of unconventionality, which corroborates the general impression TR-Turkish speakers have of NL-Turkish (and other immigrant varieties) that it has diverged quite a bit from Turkish as spoken in Turkey. There were many cases that occurred only once or twice in which a construction was used not quite the same as it is used in TR-Turkish, cf. Ex. (5). The border between unconventional word combination (often a loan translation) and unconventional use of a construction is not always easy to make: is the unconventionality in (5) located in the combination of the words for ‘French’ and ‘do’, or in the usage of the construction ‘Noun + do’? On the basis of this one example, we would do well with the more conservative interpretation, the first one. But the data happen to contain several combinations of this same verb *yap-* with nouns in the educational field where TR-Turkish would not have used this verb. This makes the second interpretation perhaps more likely. Either way, cumulatively, these account for the impression TR-Turkish speakers have that NL-Turkish is ‘different’. Note that this impression cannot be due to the use of Dutch words, as NL-Turkish speakers manage to avoid these when speaking to monolingual Turkish speakers, as indeed they were doing when contributing the data for our studies.

- (5) NL-Turkish:    ben okul-da       bir       sene       Fransızca       yap-tı-m.  
                          I   school-loc   one       year       French       do-past-1sg.  
                          “I have studied French for a year at high school”.
- TR-Turkish:    ben okul-da       bir       sene       Fransızca       oku-du-m.  
                          I   school-loc   one       year       French       read-past-1sg.
- Dutch:            Ik heb       een       jaar       Frans       gedaan op       school.  
                          I have       a       year       French done       at       school.

Clearer cases of structural influence are given in Ex. (6) and (7). In (6), the NL-Turkish speaker does not use an accusative case marker on the object noun where TR-Turkish would have one. One possible reason for this may be that Dutch does not construe the Goal argument of ‘like’ as a direct object (note the genitive preposition ‘van’ in the Dutch translation), and that this abstract feature has been transferred to Turkish. One could say that NL-Turkish is more susceptible to the Transitivity Scale (Hopper & Thompson 1981), and that this is set in motion by contact with Dutch. In (7), the Dutch convention of pairing the word for ‘difference’ with the preposition ‘with’ is copied into Turkish, while TR-Turkish makes use of the ablative case marker instead.

- (6) NL-Turkish:    Türk       müziğ-i                               çok       sev-iyor-um.  
                          Turkish music-poss.3sg                               a.lot       like-prog-1sg.  
                          “I like Turkish music a lot”

	Dutch:	Ik	hou	van	Turkse muziek.			
		I	like	of	Turkish music.			
		“I like Turkish music”						
	TR-Turkish:	Türk	müziğ-i-ni		çok	sev-iyor-um.		
		Turkish	music-poss.3sg-acc		a.lot	like-prog-1sg.		
		“I like Turkish music a lot”						
(7)	NL-Turkish:	Hiç	fark-ı		yok	İngiliz-le		
		No	difference-poss.3sg		exist.not	English-with.		
		“There is no difference with the English.”						
	Dutch:	er	is helemaal	geen	verschil	met	engels-en	
		There	is absolutely	no	difference	with	English-pl	
	TR-Turkish:	hiç	fark-ı		yok	ingiliz-den		
		No	difference-poss.3sg		exist.not	English-abl		

Dutch influence should not automatically be assumed, however, whenever an unconventional structure is encountered. Not all contact-induced change is borrowing, and not all apparent unconventionality holds up to scrutiny. It is here where the collection of a parallel corpus of TR-Turkish proved helpful. In (8), the missing accusative marker on the direct object could be hypothesized to be the result of Dutch influence, as Dutch does not make use of case marking. However, the TR-Turkish corpus yielded some examples such as (9), in which the accusative marker, expected according to Turkish standard norms, is missing as well (also see Example 6 above). Note that in both examples, the verb is low in transitivity: NL-Turkish may be exactly like TR-Turkish in not always marking the direct object of a low-transitivity verb with accusative.

(8)	NL-Turkish:	Türkçe	iyi	konuş-uyor-lar	mı?	
		Turkish	good	speak-prog-3pl	Q	
		“Do they speak Turkish well?”				
	Dutch:	Spreek-en	ze	goed	Turks?	
		Speak-3pl	they	good	Turkish	
		“Do they speak Turkish well?”				
	TR-Turkish:	Türkçe-yi	iyi	konuş-uyor-lar	mı?	
		Turkish-acc	good	speak-prog-3pl	Q	
		“Do they speak Turkish well?”				
(9)	TR-Turkish:	Ben	Kırşehir yemek-ler-i	bil-ir-im.		
		I	Kırşehir dish-pl-poss.3	know-pres-1sg.		

Expected:	Ben	Kırşehir yemek-ler-i-ni	bil-ir-im.
	I	Kırşehir dish-pl-poss.3-acc	know-pres-1sg.

#### 4. Loan Translations

As was mentioned earlier, loan translations have not received much discussion in the theoretical literature on contact phenomena. From the above overview of Turkish-Dutch examples, it is already apparent that it can be related to other phenomena, primarily to insertional codeswitching and to structural interference. In this section, the phenomenon will first be discussed in a bit more detail, illustrating the various subtypes in which it occurs, and this will be followed up with an assessment of the underlying mechanisms that most likely produce loan translations.

Backus & Dorleijn (2009) provides an overview of previous treatments of the phenomenon. Briefly, there are two frameworks in which loan translation are discussed in relation to other phenomena. The most far-reaching of these is the Code Copying Model (Johanson 2002), in which loan translations, referred to as a type of Selective Copying, is explicitly classed with other types of structural copying, that is: taking elements from the other language that are not overt. Overt elements are words and morphemes: taking them from another language is called ‘Global Copying’. Johanson distinguishes between various subtypes of selective copying, depending on what is copied, and loan translations are spread over two of these: Semantic Copying, in which the meaning or usage of a foreign equivalent is used with the native word (this is often referred to as ‘semantic extension’), and Combinational Copying, in which a foreign word combination is employed in the copying language, using the native words. Especially the latter subtype is close to what contact linguists have generally referred to as loan translation. The other framework in which loan translations figure is the Matrix Language Frame Model (Myers-Scotton 2002), though their role is small. To account for loan translations, among other things, the notion of a Composite Matrix Language has been developed. This refers to a structure that seems to be entirely in one language, but in which the ‘lexical structure’ may partly be from another language. Loan translations are typical examples of foreign lexical structure.

To characterize loan translation further, it is necessary to define them in a way that can carry substantial consensus, and that relates them to other contact effects. This means we need a picture of what subtypes there are, how precise the copy has to be, and of what types of foreign models are involved. Here, the focus will be on the subdivisions. As for the other characteristics, examples will illustrate that the translation is often not very precise, and that the foreign models tend to be idioms, collocations, and figurative shades of meaning.

One useful subdivision is based on the type of morpheme involved. Prototypical loan translations involve content words, but there is a fine line dividing these from loan translations involving function words, grammatical markers and discourse patterns (the last of these will be ignored here). We will see that the underlying mechanism through which the various types are produced are similar, but that the outcome in the case of the non-content word cases could equally

well be called interference. The point that will be made is that this is not a coincidence: there is a continuum going from loan translation to interference, and the specificity of the meaning involved (lexical for content words and grammatical for functional elements and patterns) is the organizing dimension underlying this continuum.

Loan translations always involve a change of meaning. The simplest case is when just one word is involved, semantic extension. In (10), the Turkish word *kalabalık* ‘crowded’ is used with the meanings ‘busy’ and ‘noisy’, meanings it does not have in TR-Turkish but which its Dutch translation equivalent, *druk*, does have.

- (10) a        çocuk-lar        bugün çok        kalabalık.  
               child-PL        today very        crowded  
               “The children are very noisy today”  
       b        bugün çok        kalabalığım.  
               today very        crowded.be.1sg  
               “I am very busy today”

When two or more words are involved, as in Ex. (3) above, repeated here for convenience as (11), the striking fact is the unconventional combination, but this almost always entails that at least one of the words is used with a new shade of meaning as well. In (11), the meaning of *vermek* ‘give’ is extended to include the metaphorical transfer of blame.

- (11) suç-u                bana        ver-di  
               guilt-ACC        to.me        give-PAST.3sg  
               ‘he accused me’  
       (cf. Dutch: *de schuld geven*; ‘give the guilt’; Turkish *suçlamak* ‘accuse’: *suç-la-mak* ‘guilt-VERBALIZER-INF’)

As soon as we move our attention to functional elements we move into the terrain of grammatical interference. Above, examples with the demonstrative pronoun, the postposition *-le* ‘with’, and accusative case marking were discussed; another example is the replacement of dative by accusative in (12).

- (12) NL-Turkish:    anne-m                                sor-du                arkadaşları-nı  
                           mother-POSS-1sg                ask-PAST.3sg        friends-ACC  
                           “my mother asked her friends (something)”  
       TR-Turkish:    anne-m                                sor-du                arkadaşları-na  
                           mother-POSS-1sg                ask-PAST.3sg        friends-DAT  
                           “my mother asked her friends (something)”

Dutch:	mijn	moeder	heeft	haar	vriendinnen	gevraagd
	My	mother	has	her	friends	asked

Note that Dutch construes the Goal argument of ‘ask’ as a direct object, while TR-Turkish construes it as an indirect object. NL-Turkish follows Dutch usage. If such construal conventions are accepted to be part of the meaning of ‘ask’, it is defensible to say the contact effect here is a case of imported meaning (‘loan translation’) as much as it is a case of imported structure (‘structural interference’). Which term is used does not matter much, perhaps, as long as it is understood that they do not refer to different phenomena, just to different aspects of the same change.

## 5. Contact phenomena: Overview

The goal of the present section is to link the various contact phenomena described so far together more explicitly. Recall we have discussed codeswitching (only the insertional subtype will concern us here), loan translation and structural interference. Insertional codeswitching was defined as the use of foreign lexical elements in a clause that is otherwise in the base language. Looked at it from a diachronic viewpoint, such words may or may not be established as commonly used words that happen to originate in the other languages. If they are, these words are, also, lexical borrowings. Therefore, synchronic codeswitching and diachronic borrowing are each other’s counterparts. First use of a foreign word is by definition codeswitching, but also sets it off on its diachronic journey towards loanword status. Whether it is used with reference to its foreign origin at later instances must be examined at a case-by-case basis: if it is, it should be analyzed as synchronic codeswitching even though it is already established as a lexical borrowing; often, the more entrenched it is as a loanword, the less likely it is that the word will be used with reference to its potential to index the norms and values associated with the other language. There are many words in any language contact setting that qualify as cultural loanwords: these are unlikely to have a high indexicality potential, simply because they are the only words that can possibly be used to refer to the concept they lexicalize. In NL-Turkish, an example would be *Hemelvaart*, ‘Ascension Day’, an important day in the Dutch calendar as it is a holiday. It is quite logical that Turkish speakers would adopt this word, and they are unlikely to use it as a codeswitch. It is simply the word for Ascension Day in NL-Turkish. The picture may be quite different, though, for words that do have equivalents in Turkish. These words may well be fairly entrenched in NL-Turkish, yet at the same time often be used because the speaker wants to flavor his or her Turkish with some Dutch. Such examples illustrate quite clearly that the synchronic and diachronic sides of the coin, while intimately related, should be carefully distinguished in the analysis.

For loan translation and structural interference, a similar account is needed. A particular instance of loan translation may have been produced synchronically as a case of direct translation, or it may

by now be an established usage (in the case of semantic extension) or collocation (in the case of prototypical loan translation) in the borrowing language, brought about diachronically through repeated usage. We could refer to the synchronic case as ‘loan translation’ and to the diachronic case as ‘lexical change’ (since the use of particular lexical items has undergone change. If an NL-Turkish speaker produces *piyano oynamak* ‘play the piano’, with the Turkish word for ‘play’ instead of the TR-Turkish combination with the word for ‘sound’, *çalmak*, that may be an online (i.e. synchronic) translation of the equivalent Dutch unit (with *spelen*, the word for ‘play’), or the selection of one of the combinations in that speaker’s idiolect for that concept, perhaps even its only one if the translated combination has pushed out its TR-Turkish equivalent. This would represent lexical change in the idiolect; to the extent that it also holds for other speakers it could also represent lexical change in NL-Turkish. Exactly the same holds for cases of structural interference. An NL-Turkish speaker who synchronically produces an unconventional instance of plural marking as in (13), may have done so because of real online interference from Dutch, or because his idiolect contains an entrenched pattern in which the combination of *hiç* ‘never’, a negated transitive verb and a generic object noun requires plural marking on that noun, like in Dutch.

- (13)    NL-Turkish:    hiç        Türkçe kitap-lar        oku-ya-m-ıyor-um  
                              no        Turkish book-PL        read-ABIL-NEG-PROG-1sg  
                              “I can’t read Turkish books”
- TR- Turkish:    hiç        Türkçe kitap                okuyamıyorum,  
                              no        Turkish book                read-ABIL-NEG-PROG-1sg
- Dutch:        ik        kan        geen        Turkse        boek-en        lezen  
                              I        can        no        Turkish        book-pl        read

The picture that is developing now makes use of three dimensions on which the various phenomena can be ordered: whether the transferred element is overt or not, whether the source is a lexical or structural element, and whether the phenomenon is synchronic or diachronic. This produces six language contact phenomena, which relate to each other in different ways on these three dimensions. This is presented schematically in Figure 1.

	Synchronic	Diachronic
Foreign words	Insertional codeswitching	Lexical borrowing
Foreign meaning/combinations	Semantic extension/Loan translation	Lexical change
Foreign structure	Interference	Structural change/borrowing

Figure 1: Overview of language contact phenomena

## 6. Conclusion and discussion

The present contribution has argued a number of things. First, it has aimed to show that studying language change is not just beneficial for contact linguistics, but also serves to bring the studies of language contact and of language in general closer to each other. If linguistic competence is usage-based, change is an inherent consequence, since levels of entrenchment will fluctuate continuously, producing ever-changing idiolects and, therefore, ever-changing languages, if ‘language’ is taken to be the sum total of multiple idiolects that are fairly similar to each other. These considerations themselves require that synchrony and diachrony are carefully distinguished, yet related to one another. Synchrony is the ‘horizontal’ temporal level at which linguistic practice is produced: usage. Diachrony is the ‘vertical’ level, at which the effect of these practices is recorded, in terms of ever-changing inventories and degrees of entrenchment for the elements within these inventories. Since speaking is creative and volitional, always adapted to changing communicative circumstances, competence always changes. Second, a new perspective has been launched on the old debate about how to distinguish codeswitching and borrowing, focusing on the synchronic nature of the former and the diachronic one of the latter. Third, assuming the conceptualization of lexicon and syntax as different regions on a continuum of specificity has made it possible to compare the different contact phenomena more directly, and to show that loan translation and structural borrowing are difficult to separate (see, for example, the discussion of the unconventional use of adpositions). Fourth, at a sufficiently abstract level lexical and structural borrowing are not all that different. Both start out as innovations in bilingual speech, and become conventionalized through repeated usage (Croft 2000). The only difference is that lexical change may be more under conscious control than structural change, so that it is more likely to be set in motion intentionally. This in itself reduces to a general difference between lexical and structural elements: metalinguistic attention for the former is higher than for the latter, and this, in turn, is a function of the higher semantic specificity of lexical items, especially content words. That is, the attractiveness of lexical items (including the multiword units that produce loan translations) lies mostly in their semantics, while the attractiveness of structural features is probably determined more by their frequency. High frequency stimulates high degrees of entrenchment in idiolects, and these in turn increase the potential to bring about interference. However, not much is known about the degree to which speakers direct metalinguistic attention to structural elements. To be sure, some constructions do have fairly specific semantics, or are perceptually very salient. These factors may well stimulate metalinguistic attention, and in that case their borrowing may be just as intentional as is often the case for lexical items.

The mechanism suggested to underlie all contact-induced change in which the source of the change is cross-linguistic influence (by far the majority of contact-induced changes, but not all) is translation. The origin of the change lies in the wish to say something the way it is said in the other language. There is at least one necessary condition for translation to take place: there has to be a fairly transparent link between the form in question and a translation equivalent in the base language, since otherwise properties of the foreign element cannot be transferred to a native element.



Synchronically, the translation may be the result of intentional selection or of unintentional interference. Note that the reported number of translations probably underestimates the pervasiveness of the process. This is because the process is only evident when unconventionality results. If base and source language have the same structure or combination, for instance, translation may still covertly reinforce the existing norms, but we have no way of knowing. Basically, unconventionality is only noticeable if the translation has produced a novel form or if a figurative meaning has been produced that was not in use before contact (cf. the discussion of the various loan translations involving content words above). In TR-Turkish one ‘gets on’ a train, while in both NL-Turkish and Dutch one ‘takes’ a train. For Turkish, this has added a new shade of figurative meaning to the lexeme that means ‘take’.

It is clear that loan translations require much more study. It is at present hard to say how pervasive the phenomenon is, to what extent it should be distinguished from structural interference, and, if so, how the distinction should be made, and when speakers typically opt for a loan translation rather than a codeswitch for the multiword unit in the other language. At the same time, the codeswitching literature could benefit from considering a diachronic perspective and from paying attention to structure as well as to the lexicon.

## References

- Backus, Ad (1992) *Patterns of language mixing. A study in Turkish-Dutch bilingualism*. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Backus, Ad (1996). *Two in one: Bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Backus, Ad & Margreet Dorleijn (2009) Loan translations versus code-switching. In: B. Bullock & A.J. Toribio (eds.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 75-93.
- Bybee, Joan (2006). From usage to grammar: The mind’s response to repetition. *Language* 82: 711-733.
- Croft, William (2000). *Explaining Language Change: An Evolutionary Approach*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Doğruöz, Ayse Seza (2007) *Synchronic variation and diachronic change in Dutch Turkish: A corpus-based analysis*. Ph.D. dissertation, Faculty of Humanities, Universiteit van Tilburg.
- Goldberg, Adele (2006) *Constructions at work: The nature of generalizations in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva (2005) *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra Thompson (1980) Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language*, 56: 251-299.

- Johanson, Lars (2002) *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2008) *Cognitive Grammar. A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel (2007) Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31, 4: 829-65.
- Muysken, Pieter (2000). *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (2002). *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, Malcolm (2008). A history of metatypy in the Bel languages. *Journal of Language Contact*, 2: 149-164.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey (2001) *Language contact: an introduction*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufmann (1988) *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Weinreich, Uriel (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.